

<b>1. Density Lower Limit - R-40 (9 units, per lot parking)</b>
This is an R-40 and I feel it should stay that way to limit the impact on the town school system and traffic/Utilities
Tiny Homes
I am not in favor of this option. It limits public access way too much, and it would adversely impact the flora and fauna on the existing plot.
This option would have been my first choice before the town bought the land. This is what was envisioned in the comprehensive plan- a continuation of low density residential. This would have had the least impact on traffic and likely would have had the highest return as far as tax revenue for the town. And the town wouldn't have had to spend any money on it. I would support this option still if they were market value, single family homes with the 20% designated affordable.
Does not meet the voter's desire for adult housing or to keep the current structure. It adds nothing and may not even pay itself off.
This is acceptable, as it is in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood and would benefit town tax revenues. The disadvantage of this option is that it does not preserve any of the green space and view corridors for the benefit of the town. It also does not address the senior housing needs. As a result this is not my preferred option.
This is in keeping with the existing neighborhood. These homes would raise significant tax revenue for the town given the property size and the location near the water. However, it does not preserve green space and it does not honor the initial reasons the town bought the property- to provide senior housing and preserve green space for all Barrington residents. This is not my preferred option.
This option would limit impact from traffic which is a major issue on Watson. The road is narrow, children ride bikes (not just from the immediate neighborhood as this is a regular biking route connecting the greater Nayatt and Matthewson neighborhoods to Middle Highway. This allows for safe biking avoiding Nayatt road. The downside is that it doesn't do much that is unique but it would be in character with the neighborhood.
This design provides for taking care of our seniors and protecting open space.
Definitely my first choice. It would provide homes for seniors that have been supporting this town for years by paying their taxes. Let's give back to our seniors without ruining our town.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>* R40 - (7 lots + 2 affordable) is an excellent option!!</li><li>* extremely desirable to neighborhood - this was not previously posed as an option!</li><li>* town will get all money back - return on investment</li><li>* 300-400K to tear down, water view lots - 700K conservative, non water view 500K</li><li>* taxes would not be impacted</li><li>* least impact and most in keeping with neighborhood</li><li>* no impact on lighting, noise, traffic</li><li>* no protected open space unless we keep R40 and reduce number of houses allowed</li></ul>
It is imperative that you consider the current low density of the neighborhood in order to best serve the community. The options for green space, community garden, walk paths, sports courts, and a community/art centre should not be disregarded. All those would be more in sync with the needs and nature of the family oriented neighborhood around and beyond 25 Watson Ave.
Total development cost w/out land will be close to \$800,000 at this density. Land will add another \$400,000 per unit. This is crazy for 9 homes.

<b>2. Density Lower Limit - R-25 (15 units, per lot parking)</b>
Only half of the land at most should be rated at R-25. This would reduce the number of units to 7 at most. The existing wooded areas should be maintained along with allowance for walking trails across the existing plot.
We prefer as few units as possible to have it as least dense as possible.
Does not meet the voter's desire for adult housing or to keep the current building. Even if removing the building ends up being desired, this does not maintain open space. Blah
This is in keeping with the existing neighborhood. These homes would raise significant tax revenue for the town given the property size and the location near the water. However, it does not preserve green space and it does not honor the initial reasons the town bought the property- to provide senior housing and preserve green space for all Barrington residents. This is not my preferred option.
This is acceptable, as it is in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood and would benefit town tax revenues. The disadvantage of this option is that it does not preserve any of the green space and view corridors for the benefit of the town. It also does not address the senior housing needs. As a result this is not my preferred option.
This option is OK but it isn't taking advantage of the unique opportunity to preserve open space which can be used by Barrington residents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>* In keeping with comprehensive plan (zoning allows only 1 step down)</li><li>* this is similar to surrounding area zoning on Adelaide/Clarke</li><li>* property values not impacted</li><li>* low density as agreed to in visioning process</li><li>* supports seniors as required by comprehensive plan</li><li>* low impact on neighbors as required by comprehensive plan</li><li>* no protected space unless we reduce number of houses allowed to allow for walking trails. Maybe do R25 with 9 homes/2 affordable plus open space</li><li>* Town will turn a profit &amp; can reduce taxes for elderly</li></ul>
Total development cost w/out land will be close to \$700,000 at this density. Land will add another \$233,000 per unit. This is crazy for 15 homes.

<b>3. Middle Density - R-10 (30 units, per lot parking)</b>
Only half of the land at most should be rezoned in this way. The remainder should be managed as a town property for town resident use including walking trails through the existing wooded areas of the plot.
Does not meet the voter's desire for adult housing or to keep the current building. Even if we can get that through the next town meeting, this does not keep any open space. It does nothing for the town other than increasing the tax base.
This is unacceptable, as it is more dense than the surrounding neighborhood, and represents a greater than one step change to the zoning against the recommendation of the Town Comprehensive Plan. Additional disadvantages of this option is that it does not preserve any of the green space and view corridors for the benefit of the town, it does not specifically address the senior housing needs, and it places undue pressure on the narrow roads and Nayatt school. As a result this is not my preferred option.
This option is unacceptable. This is NOT in keeping with the existing neighborhood. It is more than 1 step change to zoning as recommended in the TCP. It is denser than the surrounding neighborhood, it places more pressure on the environment and creates potential run off into the bay. Construction would be difficult & dangerous to neighborhood residents especially small children playing outside and general pedestrians, given the small size of existing roads. The traffic increases would be very problematic in this quiet neighborhood. Again it does not preserve green space and it does not honor the initial reasons the town bought the property- to provide senior housing and preserve green space for all Barrington residents. This is not my preferred option.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>* R10 is Extremely high density (not allowed by comprehensive plan (zoning 1 step down)</li><li>* R10 equals 10 houses on a one acre lot - Watson Ave currently has 8 homes, this would become 70-80 houses if we were an R10 zone</li><li>* zero open space</li><li>* The R10 district in Barrington evolved over time as quaint beach cottages, not a cookie cutter R10 neighborhood.</li><li>* Residents chose to live in this quiet neighborhood on a quiet road</li><li>* R10 is not keeping the look and feel of the community which goes against the comprehensive plan</li><li>* Any developer could have done the same, yet Barrington decided to buy this property to prevent unsightly development and to allow residents to decide what to do with it, and it definitely wasn't to put as many units into the land as possible which is not in keeping with the look and feel of Barrington or the neighborhood</li></ul>
In Rhode Island to achieve reasonable development costs you need a minimum of 40 units. RI Housing only allows \$20,000 - \$40,000 per unit as an acquisition cost. $30 \times \$40,000 = \$1.2$ million. The town will have to eat the rest of the cost plus be faced with \$600,000 per unit development cost.
A more creative use of duplex units and street planing (ala Sweetbeiar) could have units facing Watson Street a layer of parking and two rows of units facing a north /south open space directed toward the beach. The row toward Fremont could have parking between or behind with woods as buffer. Parking is all internal open space faces water.
Housing for seniors make a lot of sense and keeps people in Barrington

#### **4. Density Site Specific - Building Re-Use (24 units, 51 parking spaces)**

My concern with adding higher density in this parcel is the added vehicular traffic that comes with it. We have become accustomed to the very little traffic on Watson when the nuns were our neighbors. So in order, to reuse the building or develop the land in any way - we will have to accept the fact there will be an increase in traffic in the neighborhood. As a parent with three young children...this concerns me and I struggle to find the right answer. I appreciate the philosophy of reusing the building and creating well designed spaces for everyone to enjoy. I would almost rather see the building used as a recreational space , environmental education center, museum than for any type of housing.

This option, designated as senior housing, seems like the best compromise between minimizing impact on the neighborhood and getting something the town needs, senior housing. The lower number of units means less traffic, senior housing means less impact on schools and is a noted area of need, particularly as outlined in the comprehensive plan. Additionally, I believe there was a large call for senior housing at the town financial meeting and many people assumed that is what the town would endorse for the use. At the same time, repurposing the existing building leaves the remaining land open for beautiful green space, which is rapidly disappearing and should be preserved so that present and future Barringtonians can enjoy it.

I attending the original Town Council meeting to approve the purchase of 25 Watson Avenue site and it was clear from the speakers and the voting that the approval was for the building to be retained and used for senior housing. I have also attended most if not all of the zoom meetings so I feel informed about the process and options presented to date. Again, it seems a clear consensus that the density be limited to the existing building with whatever small additions necessary to comfortably accommodate units for seniors wishing to stay in town. Any deviation from this plan should require advance town notification and a vote.

As an added point, I was on the Representative Town Committee of Greenwich, CT and we were the elected body (230 people representing 13 town districts) charged with approving town expenditures including the entire town budget. If there was an issue such as this (buying property and developing a plan for its development), it would have required a significant majority vote. I was alarmed to learn that this expensive expenditure and commitment was determined by ONE single vote and that many of the votes were cast by people that showed up after the voice and hand (?) vote didn't clearly determine a Yay or Nay. Many people were texting others to show up and vote without hearing any of the speeches.

We prefer preserving the building and rehabilitating it, as featured in this design, as our top choice. We prefer keeping the rest of the space open.

We like the idea of preserving the building but think it's too many units.

We prefer to preserving the building; this has too far many units and will contribute to traffic .

As an aging resident living in Barrington for the past 53 years, I have observed a need for more housing options for residents who want to remain here, either in their own home or to down-size to a more manageable site, but not have to relinquish all activities they have enjoyed over the years-social, exercise, volunteering, intergenerational experiences, and meeting new friends. Renovation of the Monastery building and adding small accessible and affordable units with surrounding open spaces would serve optimally our aging residents with sensitivity and respect for their contributions to our community over the years.

This is the default option. It meets voter desire and maintains open space. I think we could do more, and more may in fact be better for the town. I'd accept this if it was the consensus choice.

This is my preferred option. It achieves the goals set out in the TFM and represents the maximum density that should be considered on this property. It achieves a density of 24 units in a compact existing unit, while maximizing the green space and view corridors for the benefit of the town. If age restricted, it could address the senior housing needs. Building reuse is the most environmentally friendly option, which when combined with solar and other modern environmental best building practices could meet the towns sustainability goals. I like the path connecting Watson to Freemont, as walking along Nayatt road is dangerous since there is no walkway. This design could be improved by moving the carpark to the north and middle of the property, adding a

connecting road to Freemont, and adding 'town parking' and a 'senior' walking trail to the south of the property for the benefit of all town residents. This is my preferred option.

This is my preferred option.  
This is essentially what the town voted yes to at the TFM when the property was purchased. The building is already part of this quiet neighborhood. It can be repurposed which is a much greener option.  
If it were age-restricted it would provide quiet residential housing for seniors in a beautiful natural area which stays beautiful.  
Barrington seniors downsizing naturally opens up market opportunities for young families to move into the homes seniors are moving out of.  
This option would preserve not only the monastery building (another promise made to the townspeople) it would also preserve open space for all Barrington residents. Currently there are no real walking trails that are universally designed or accessible in Barrington and this property could meet those needs especially with the provision of benches and some parking spots (handicapped accessible & regular.)  
This option preserves the existing trees, view corridor and natural habitat which we should all be fighting to preserve for future generations.  
The connection between Freemont and Watson is especially welcome as a local walker I currently have to walk along Nayatt road, a dangerous option as there are no sidewalks beyond Broadview.

This is my favorite option. It limits traffic, it would preserve open space for Barrington, it preserves a really unique site with fabulous views, the large open spaces in the neighborhood are all private. The reuse of the monastery preserves the character of the neighborhood, and it should be for seniors. Overall this checks all the boxes and is most consistent with the comprehensive plan and is closest to the intent and wording of the vote at the town hall meeting. It is also an important compromise between the importance of limiting impact on the neighborhood (an essential aspect of the comprehensive plan) while also creating housing for 55+ seniors.

Low density re use the building only access on Fremont no impact or traffic on Watson so that children can be safe

Low impact so that residents can enjoy the open space as well as over 55 senior housing only

- 1st choice of neighborhood
- this option checks every box of the comprehensive plan
- this option checks every box of the watson ave visioning process
- this option checks every box of the vote at the FTM
- preserves building as required in referendum
- preserves open space as agreed to in visioning process
- low density as agreed to in visioning process
- limits traffic especially if 55+ residents
- preserves a safe neighborhood for the many walkers, runners, bicyclists and small children
- supports seniors (55+) as required by comprehensive plan, visioning process, and was passionately requested by many at FTM
- low impact on neighborhood as required by comprehensive plan
- inclusive of community (walking trails and few spaces to access beach R.O.W.)
- maintains the neighborhood charm (required in comprehensive plan)
- keeps neighborhood as is and improves on aesthetics with improvements such as parking lot around side of building and more landscaping
- many people voted to keep the monastery due to information circulating at the time that purchasing the property meant open space for the community, we should honor those that voted in this way

In addition to previous comments:

- the greenest building is the existing building
- this is the safest option with the least long term disruption to the neighborhood
- building reuse would minimize the interruption of daily life from construction trucks, demolition, rebuilding,

<p>dirt &amp; noise!!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- if entire neighborhoods of "cottage courts" or homes were developed the neighbors would have to endure construction for many many years to come rather than keeping the construction within the building</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>* This is a huge compromise for greater than R25 housing in a current R40 zone</li><li>* Zion will fill a huge need for housing</li><li>* Seniors would not impact the burden that already exists on capacity at Nayatt School</li></ul> <p>*****</p> <p>The Comprehensive plan lists as a primary goal HN-2: Ensure that future development is compatible with the character of Barrington in general and that of individual neighborhoods</p> <p>*****</p> <p>The comprehensive plan is a legal document approved by the town and the points made in it should not be taken lightly. Much study and thought was put into this plan and we should not try to drastically change it to suit our needs. Statements from the Comprehensive Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Meet the need of an aging 55+ population</li><li>- Embrace a cleaner, greener future</li><li>- Conserve and protect the special qualities of Barrington Neighborhoods</li><li>- Protect environmentally sensitive areas</li><li>- The plan questions: How can the town preserve community character?</li><li>- It discusses the intent of Zion as designated for senior housing</li><li>- Higher density development can put pressure on the surrounding neighborhood, introducing more units per acre than zoned raises concerns including impact on the community character, traffic, infrastructure, and the Town and school budget</li><li>- the town anticipates continue construction of apartments on redevelopment sites within the "Neighborhood Business "and "Business" Zones where they are a "permitted" use.</li><li>- under Goals, Objectives, Policies and Actions - many objectives are listed to promote senior housing</li></ul>
<p>Any larger development on this property would impose upon the neighborhood a major change in environment. The monastery should be renovated and used for Barrington Elders who want to move out of their homes but stay in the area. Any other use would deviate from the vote that the Town took on the major use of this property.</p>
<p>Any larger development on this property would impose upon the neighborhood a major change in environment. The monastery should be renovated and used for Barrington Elders who wish to move out of their homes but stay in our area. Any other use would be deviating from the vote that the Town took on the major use of this property.</p>
<p>lowest density, most open space, most true to the use of the property the town voted for, includes senior housing,</p> <p>lest traffic problems on Nayatt and Middle Highway. These roads are used to bypass the town center coming from Rumstick</p>
<p>My comments are not only for this site, but also for the less density alternatives. The Town is running out of space at the Forest Chapel cemetery. Though it owns property on George Street, would there be a way to utilize the property specifically on the north side as a cemetery since it could mirror Forest Chapel, remain open space and public access. Incidentally the Nuns were buried on this side of the property.</p>
<p>Less is more , more open space for the community to enjoy . I'm not hearing enough about open space plans for all in the area to enjoy.</p>
<p>This is the best fit for the neighborhood.</p>
<p>Option 4 with affordable senior housing with preference given to existing and past Barrington residents.</p>
<p>My preference is to keep the existing building and utilize some of the parking spaces for public use. 24 units is a very acceptable number.</p>
<p>Option 4 would be the best option for our town. It offers lots of beautiful green space as well as provides a limited number of units and parking to maintain the atmosphere of the surrounding homes.</p>

<p>The building must be demolished to provide the best value to the community. It's structure, layout and location severely impact any future re-use</p>
<p>It would be best to allow public access to the walking trails so that 55+ residents can also receive a benefit. It can be open until sunset and have motion sensor lights. Driveway should wrap around building to be close enough for residents. Entrance on watson, exit on freemont Small parking lot for beach R.O.W.</p>
<p>The town should retain the undeveloped land at all cost for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The town will be able to prevent areas intended as open space from being absorbed into the development during the process.</li><li>2. If a developer is assured that the property around the building is preserved for open space and is available to the residents, he gets that benefit with zero cost.</li><li>3. Having the town retain the property could reduce the developers initial construction costs, and the long term maintenance costs.</li><li>4. A huge bonus for the town is if in the future there is any trouble with kids hanging out at night, etc that requires adjustment in how the space is managed (fencing, gate, lighting, etc.) those adjustments will be more easily made without having to negotiate with the property owner.</li></ol>
<p>Low density and lots of green scape</p>
<p>Makes no sense to save this building due to siting and parking in front.</p>
<p>The property should be split, giving the town control over the land and thus guaranteeing it will remain green space. Developer can have the building. Is there an option for the town to take the green space area part and rezone it as preservation land? Walking paths could go through it for town residents use.</p>
<p>This what the community was told we were going to be supporting by voting to purchase the property. Any change from this should require a revote by the entire community.</p>
<p>This option would be my first choice. It is most compatible with maintaining the integrity of the neighborhood in terms of aesthetics and traffic flow, while allowing local residents to access open space walking paths.</p>
<p>If Concept 10 isn't viable, I vote for Concept 4, which minimizes the impact on this special property, and maintains the most of the existing wildlife corridor, pollinator pathways, and existing vegetation. Adding in the two walking paths would make this property a gem that would be treasured by all Barrington residents.</p>
<p>This design is most consistent with the vote at the Town Financial Meeting authorizing the Town to acquire and preserve the Monastery property by preserving the monastery building and all of the open space surrounding it.</p>
<p>As a board member of the the Barrington Land Conservtion Trust I feel that aside from no development at all, Concept 4 is most consistent with our values of preserving open space and forested areas in town for the enjoyment of it's citizens and to the benefit of wildlife.</p>
<p>Balances open protecting open space and development.</p>
<p>This option preserves a good amount of open space and existing vegetation. I do wonder what the relative cost of renovating the existing building compared to removing it and building new is. Would the new building be much more energy efficient for example?</p>

## 5. Density Site Specific - Cottage Courts (42 units, 78 parking spaces)

First, I'd point out that we live in this neighborhood: Bluff Road. We have walked this neighborhood (Watson) for 30 years so we are very familiar with it. --I am repeatedly astounded to hear people advocate for "open space" and "walking trails". This is not what we voted for at the Town meeting. We voted for senior & affordable housing. There is nothing about the Watson lot that renders it "environmentally sensitive." ---As for "walking trails" --this is ridiculous. There are many lovely walking trails in the Brickyard property (2 minutes north of the monastery) and there is the beach (2 minutes south of the monastery). Also, I would not want people walking through my yard, so I don't see the rationale for making public "trails" in this development; peoples' homes and yards will be here. Obviously there are not trails on some of the larger properties that currently abut the monastery property! --- Next, when I voted for this acquisition I still was opposed to the idea of keeping the monastery building, and everything still convinces me that it should be removed. It is not attractive, and the cost of renovating it would be vastly greater than removing it and building new residential units. I don't see it as at all compatible with any of the housing proposals. ---I basically lean to a version of the "cottage" proposal. However, I think 43 units is too many for the site; I'd like to see this substantially reduced. It also appeared to me that all the cottages were two stories; as my wife and I begin to look for "senior" housing, one of the main requirements would be "one floor" living --for obvious reasons.

I am a member of the 25 Watson Ad Hoc Committee and a resident of the monastery neighborhood. I am unable to attend the next meeting in person on Monday, February 28 so will be observing via zoom. As an observer, I'm not able to offer comments and am taking this opportunity to express my views through this survey.

I'm excited to be on the committee and believe the town's purchase of the monastery property offers a unique opportunity to introduce an attractive, innovative housing option compatible with the neighborhood. It appears a majority on the committee agree that the current monastery has no historical significance and is not an attractive structure worth maintaining. Also, while the committee consultants have not yet provided data on the cost to rehab this structure, contractors who know the building have suggested the cost of renovating it could be prohibitive. I personally favor replacement but recognize that this would probably require approval at the 2022 Financial Town Meeting. Assuming the town will approve replacement, the issue is what should be built in its place?

Among the options, I believe the most suitable for this suburban neighborhood is cluster housing, referred to as "cottage courts." If well designed, these will be attractive, low rise structures that are aesthetically compatible with the area. On the other hand, replacing the monastery with another large structure for apartments/condos, because of its mass, would not be in keeping with this neighborhood of single family housing. It would definitely stand out and in a negative way.

My one concern with the current cottage court proposal is that 42 units is too dense and forces the houses on Watson to be built too close to the street. A reduction in the number of units could remedy this. There is a lot of apprehension among neighbors and other town residents about the density, traffic and look of this project. Well designed "pocket neighborhoods" or "cottage courts" with small homes would address these concerns while also providing attractive, multi-generational or senior housing.

This would not be a good fit for the area. 42 units brings with it a heavy traffic burden. In addition, this plan does not preserve much if any green space for public use. I have lived next to developments of this style. It looks neat if you are in the middle facing the front of the houses, but the other three sides are utilitarian at best and with limited storage items get propped up all over, garbage cans, etc. There is too much visibility from the road for this to look nice from any perspective other than the center.

This is WAY too many units for this space and neighborhood. We strongly oppose this model.

This has far too many units relative to the land and eliminates too much green space.

We may have a fight with at the town meeting and with the neighbors to get this through. I'd prefer a few less homes and more stand off space from the road in this design. It'd be nice in the right setting; I don't know if this is that setting. Great space for active adults, could be charming if done right.



This is my least preferred option. This is unacceptable as the density of units is much greater than 24 (existing building). This design only preserves a very limited amount of the green space for the benefit of the town. Forty two units is too many for these narrow roads and quiet neighborhood. These buildings are completely different to any other buildings in this neighborhood. I'm strongly against this design.

This is the worst option as the density is too great for this small property. Essentially the whole property is covered in houses and there is no green space for Barrington residents to enjoy. The density is far greater than the surrounding neighborhood (R25) and the traffic increase that would come along with this option is completely unfeasible for the existing roads. This is a quiet residential neighborhood where young children are playing outside and pedestrians are walking around small streets. Bikers and walkers from all over town use these roads to avoid busier roads such as Nayatt and such an increase in traffic will only lead to accidents. The town was promised the preservation of green land, access to it and the preservation of the view corridor. These will all be lost with this option.

This is unattractive. Cottage courts look OK on paper but they do not work in practice. There is no outdoor storage, parking is challenging, the density is 10-times higher than the existing neighborhood and traffic, deliveries, amazon truck and more cannot be accommodated on the narrow roads. Light and noise will severely impact the neighborhood.

- 87 parking spots is far too great of an impact to the traffic and safety
- you have to consider delivery trucks (amazon/ups) not just residents
- completely disagree with cottage courts for this neighborhood
- not in keeping with current home designs
- why introduce an entirely new style of homes rather than staying in keeping with the current neighborhood?
- cluster developments are best created where there is not already a neighborhood, but this is the opposite
- why build a neighborhood within a neighborhood - we already have a great neighborhood community!
- no privacy for residents in this cluster
- no storage for residents
- model of housing - cute in middle, but looks terrible from back is car/garbage/ac/bikes/etc
- who maintains greenspace? if neighbors need to, there is nowhere to put lawn equipment

Cottage Courts:

- 78 parking spots far too great of an impact to the traffic and safety of the children living in this neighborhood!
- Entire Watson Ave has 8 homes with less than 16 vehicles, the 2 homes on Watson/Nayatt do not drive on Watson, so adding 78 parking spots will have a huge impact on traffic
- you have to consider delivery trucks (amazon/ups) not just residents
- completely disagree with cottage courts for this neighborhood
- not in keeping with current home designs
- why introduce an entirely new style of homes rather than staying in keeping with the current neighborhood?
- cluster developments are best created where there is not already a neighborhood, but this is the opposite
- why build a neighborhood within a neighborhood - we already have a great neighborhood community!
- no privacy for residents in this cluster
- no storage for residents
- model of housing - cute in middle, but looks terrible from back is car/garbage/ac/bikes/etc
- who maintains greenspace? if neighbors need to, there is nowhere to put lawn equipment

The best combination of housing for seniors who have lived in & contributed to the community at large over the years.

I feel that it is very important for Barrington to have the best combination of appropriate housing for residents who have lived in and contributed to the Barrington community over the years and want to downsize and continue to live in place.

units 1-16 and 37-42 should be removed. the current parcel should be divided in three- the central piece for development and the left and right pieces to remain under town ownership for preservation and recreation with upkeep funded through grant funding.

It is a good idea for a different town and situation. I can't believe that this cottage options are still on the table.

I'm a member of the 25 Watson Committee attending the 3/28 meeting and am indicating my preference for use of the property. I favor cottage courts at a lower density than proposed. My view is this option is the most compatible with the idea of preserving "neighborhood." Expanding the current building or replacing it with another large structure is not a suitable alternative for preserving "neighborhood."

This is a reasonable development size financially. It is also a density that matches many nice neighborhoods in Barrington, including ours in Primrose Hill. Cluster development at the north end of the site.

If you must do cottage courts with courts running east/west have them at least open to the street not turning their backsides to Watson. Better yet why not have a row of R10 on Watson with Cottage court facing the water (N/S) behind the R10 lots. Parking to the north and west would allow plenty of cottages in a location that is more suited to a court configuration and allow houses that scale to neighborhood along Watson. Otherwise courts that turn their back to the neighborhood make no sense.

## 6. Density Site Specific - Building Re-Use with Cottage Courts (35 units, 64 parking spaces)

I feel cottages offer better options for Barrington residents to down size. In the large building community use and senior housing. Priority for seniors

We are opposed to having so many units and cars as featured in this model. This will cause too much traffic and eat up all the land space

We prefer to keep the building but suggest having fewer units.

I support having some of the options designated for seniors (62+?) without an income max. I wish there were more age-in-place options for people who are willing to spend \$500K+ to live near family in Barrington. Having beautiful and well-maintained outdoor spaces at 25 Watson is also very appealing. I'm also happy if some of the units are made income-restricted. Thank you.

Offers flexibility of options and cost. Does not greatly increase density and leaves existing vegetation on beach end.

I like this option. It'd make a little community, and would be great for the active adult population that it's aimed at. Keeps existing building, keeps some open space, and adds some potentially charming neighborhood like housing.

This is unacceptable as the density of units is greater than 24 (existing building). This design only preserves a limited amount of green space for the benefit of the town. Thirty five units is too many for these narrow roads and quiet neighborhood. Whereas I like elements of this design (building reuse, connection between Watson and Fremont, walking trail and parking to benefit town residents) and am against cottage courts as they are an inefficient way of achieving housing while maintaining the green space. I do not favor this design.

This option is unacceptable as it takes a lot more of the available green space to reach the number of units that could be achieved by building reuse plus an addition (#7) or a new building (#8). This spreads more buildings over a larger area of land and reduces green space and in my opinion it looks too dense.

The traffic increase that would come along with this option is also too great for the existing roads and neighborhood. This is a quiet residential area where young children are playing outside and pedestrians are walking around small streets. Bikers and walkers from all over town use these roads to avoid busier roads such as Nayatt and such an increase in traffic will only lead to accidents.

This design is unacceptable, as 35 units is too many for this site. Too much of the green space is lost to the development, and it would be too much pressure on the quite narrow roads in this neighborhood. I'm strongly against the cottage courts component of this design. I like the building reuse, carpark in the north mid section of the development away from the roads, and car access from both watson and fremont. I also like parking for visitors to enjoy the green space, and the walking connection between watson and fremont as it is dangerous to walk along nayatt with no side walk. The development should be age restricted to meet the needs of Barrington's seniors, and any walking paths should be aligned to senior's needs. The cottage court component of this design makes it one of my least favored options.

This is unattractive. Cottage courts look OK on paper but they do not work in practice. There is no outdoor storage, parking is challenging, the density is 10-times higher than the existing neighborhood and traffic, deliveries, amazon truck and more cannot be accommodated on the narrow roads. Light and noise will severely impact the neighborhood. Plus the cottages juxtapose the existing building simply doesn't work. It will also result in the loss of many trees and animal habitats including owls.

\*\*\*Takes away from walking trails and open space and increases parking and traffic as opposed to the Site Specific only design

Repeating comments from previous designs with cottage courts:

- cottage courts are not in keeping with current home designs
- why introduce an entirely new style of homes rather than staying in keeping with the current neighborhood?
- cluster developments are best created where there is not already a neighborhood, but this is the opposite

- why build a neighborhood within a neighborhood - we already have a great neighborhood community!
- no privacy for residents in this cluster
- no storage for residents
- model of housing - cute in middle, but looks terrible from back is car/garbage/ac/bikes/etc
- who maintains greenspace? if neighbors need to, there is nowhere to put lawn equipment

The building must be demolished to provide the best value to the community. It's structure, layout and location severely impact any future re-use

**7. Density Site Specific - Re-use of Building with Addition (44 units, 87 parking spaces)**

This would be my #1 ranked favorite design plan, but with the proviso that the development only include enough land area to accommodate the existing footprint of the existing building. There should be nothing to obstruct the southerly and southwesterly views from the present structure. In addition, the existing wooded areas on the west and north should be maintained as town managed property and these areas should not be ceded to the developer in any form. There should be walkways connecting to Fremont Street.

We prefer to keep the building but suggest having fewer units. This proposal has far too many cars and will contribute to unnecessary traffic. We prefer more green space.

This option would not be a great fit for two reasons- first, it will increase traffic due to too many units. Second, the building in the visual proposed is not an attractive building, resembling a hotel chain style building which does not fit into the area. Plus, a three-story building is too high for this area. I am also concerned that if the developer is given leeway to knock the monastery down that they will then replace it with a much larger footprint and many more units.

Too adverse an effect of traffic and the surrounding neighborhood. Too many units.

I'm good with this option. The addition may make this a more attractive property. Still keeps a lot of open space and meets with the voter intent.

This is unacceptable as the density of units is much greater than 24 (existing building). While it achieves the goals set out in the TFM and preserves the green space and view corridors for the benefit of the town, 44 units is too many for these narrow roads and quiet neighborhood. If age restricted, it could address the senior housing needs. Building reuse is the most environmentally friendly option, which when combined with solar and other modern environmental best building practices could meet the towns sustainability goals. I like the path connecting Watson to Fremont, as walking along Nayatt road is dangerous since there is no walkway. This design could be improved by adding 'town parking' and a 'senior' walking trail to the south of the property for the benefit of all town residents. I strongly recomend a smaller addition be considered as a compromise between 24 and 44 units.

This is not acceptable as 44 units are too many on this parcel of land, given the small roads and the quiet neighborhood. However if a smaller addition, somewhere between 24 and 44 units were to be added this could be a good solution!

The building is already part of this quiet neighborhood. If designed sympathetically as an addition to the existing structure it could blend acceptably into the existing site. Repurposing the existing building is much greener option.

If it were age-restricted it would provide quiet residential housing for seniors in a beautiful natural area which stays beautiful.

Barrington seniors downsizing naturally opens up market opportunities for young families to move into the homes seniors are moving out of.

This option would preserve not only the monastery building (another promise made to the townspeople) it would also preserve open space for all Barrington residents. Currently there are no real walking trails that are universally designed or accessible in Barrington and this property could meet those needs especially with the provision of benches and some parking spots (handicapped accessible & regular.)

This option preserves the existing trees, view corridor and natural habitat which we should all be fighting to preserve for future generations.

The connection between Fremont and Watson is welcome as a local walker I currently have to walk along Nayatt road, a dangerous option as there are no sidewalks beyond Broadview.

NO - the density is far too high for the neighborhood, this goes against the agreed upon comprehensive plan which states clearly that any development must limit impact on the neighborhood and that high density developments should be developed in existing high density locations.

This design would cause way too much traffic in a small, quiet residential area.

<p>Horrible idea! Let's not destroy the quiet, tranquil streets people moved to Barrington to enjoy!</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- this sounded like a good idea at first, but the drawing showed this to be an enormous addition!</li><li>- 44 units is much higher density than R10 (30) and ridiculous for this neighborhood!</li><li>- goes against visioning of low density</li><li>- higher traffic = less safe for children and pedestrians</li></ul>
<p>I am opposed to the entire parcel being passed over into developer hands- it should be divided into 3 lots. The central lot with the current building and a left and right parcel for preserving open space. I would prefer for this committee to stay and to apply for grants such as the EPA's 2022 Healthy Communities grant which can award \$40,000 to protect the resources currently on site and improve our community. There are also options such as the USA and NRCS regional conservation partnership program with an award ceiling of \$10,000,000. RI DEM's GREEN SPACE GRANT PROGRAMS can also provide 50% matching grants up to \$400,000 for local open space and 80% matching for recreation development and 50% matching for recreation acquisition- Federal Bureau of Land Management also has grants up to \$100,000 for eastern states recreation and visitor services. The current building should be retrofitted with a small addition- as a model for green design and community living- showcasing that the elderly can maintain being part of the community. There should be a new community use space in the addition for workshops and performances, or maybe to suit noise levels it could be artist studios</p>
<p>Building reuse + addition- The addition space would provide 20 units and could be more of that model of green housing which demonstrates us as a leader in thoughtful environmental and community conscious housing. I certainly am in support of access from Fremont. Current building should go through minimum investment conversion to artist studios, keep the kitchen for cooking classes and community meals, events etc, install a science and discovery center (perfectly positioned right by coast of Narragansett Bay) that could act as a satellite center for the schools. - which I understand there would be questions around how that is supported. This also aligns with a more progressive senior housing concept that does not disconnect the elderly from society but keeps the community close at hand- these various activities would be daytime activities that cause less disruption.</p> <p>What are the desires of seniors in the future? They say 60 is the new 40- well I would think when I am a senior I wouldn't want to live in disconnected housing but would appreciate elements of the community coming to where I am, in moderation, so that I dont feel cut off. This design needs to appeal to seniors now and seniors in 10, 20, 30 years.</p>
<p>87 parking spaces is way too many. For ANY plan, parking on site should not expand greatly from current amount- both for traffic and green space purposes. The community, town, state, world etc do not need more blacktop which increases temperatures as it retains heat. Also, being uphill from the bay and tidal estuaries runoff is a concern. Any plan should be stipulate careful monitoring of environmental disturbance on site and understanding how that can impact the bay and tide pools only a few hundred feet away. One site can make a difference, especially in Barrington where we are in the spotlight and have the power to impact our small state, set trends, and create a culture of care and change for our environment through a thoughtful design and build process.</p>
<p>The building must be demolished to provide the best value to the community. It's structure, layout and location severely impact any future re-use</p>
<p>As I understand it, Barrington is under the state quota for affordable housing, and risks fines from the states should we not adhere to the state quota. As such, the re-use of the building and addition of the most possible units seems like the best approach, especially if these units are subsequently offered for sale, in order to shift liability in the future away from the town and to generate additional property tax revenues.</p>
<p>This one has more living units than some while also preserving more greenspace than some. Not ideal but better than some others. It also re-uses the existing building which some think is part of the purchase agreement.</p>

## 8. Site Specific New Building (39 units, 64 parking spaces)

I have a major concern about the asbestos in the existing foundation and the rest of the existing building, and that this would be disturbed with any demolition necessary for a new building. It would be better to upgrade the existing structure to limit disturbance of the asbestos, and the necessity of repetitive testing by the town of asbestos contamination in the air and the surrounding properties.

We prefer to keep the building and suggest having fewer units. We prefer more green space.

This would probably be a nicer end result than the reuse, but I'd have to hear more justification as to why this is otherwise a superior option. No building will fit the feel of the neighborhood (including the current building), so some effort could be made so that the end result is better than the status quo.

One new building containing all units on the site is acceptable however there are too many units in this proposal, because of the increase in traffic that would ensue from 64 spaces. If the number could be reduced I believe this would be a very acceptable option

A single structure on this site keeps it similar to the single Monastery structure that has been part of the fabric of this area for the past 65 years thereby preserving the character of this quiet neighborhood. I believe it is important that all stakeholders are considered in this process including the local residents.

A beautiful new, universally designed, age restricted building could make good on the promise to Barrington's senior residents. Seniors downsizing into units in a building such as this naturally opens up market opportunities for young families to move into the homes seniors are moving out of.

Specifically designed to meet the needs of today's seniors and including communal areas this building could be very appealing.

Set amidst a beautiful natural environment this option offers a good solution to meeting the issues at hand. It provides much needed senior accommodation in Barrington, allows access to this gorgeous property for the enjoyment of all Barrington residents, and preserves natural environments and habitats as far as possible in a way that covering this small area with multiple Cottage Courts (thereby reducing everyone's access) could never do.

If it were age-restricted it would provide quiet residential housing for seniors in a beautiful natural area which stays beautiful and can be enjoyed by everyone. The beautiful views and outstanding landscape would be enjoyed by both the building's senior residents and Barrington residents alike who could access the walking trails and enjoy this special site.

I fundamentally believe that a promise was made to Barrington residents when this property was acquired- senior housing and preservation of the land for the enjoyment of all. This option allows the town to honor that commitment.

This design is unacceptable as 39 units is too many for this site. The overall size of the carpark (driven by the 39 units) illustrates just how much of the green space is lost to a development of this size. However, a new building limited to 24 units should be considered and compared against retaining the existing building, depending on the economics of refurbishment vs. new build. The height of a new building should be no greater than the existing building. The development should be age restricted to help meet the needs of Barrington's seniors. I like that any carpark is located in the north mid section of the lot, away from either entrance. The design could be improved by adding car access from both fremont and watson, and by adding a public walking connection between fremont and watson as it is dangerous walking along nayatt without a side walk. Retained green space should be accessible for the benefit of all Barrington residents. I urge the town to reconsider this design based on a new building limited to a maximum of 24 units (although I believe retaining the existing building is a more desirable and sustainable option). The advantage of a multifamily single building (new or existing) is that it allows the homes to be consolidated together to maximize the retention of green space for the benefit of the residents.

NO - the vote at the FTM was to preserve the building. The existing structure has been in the neighborhood for 70 years. It should be preserved.

\* This option leaves too many unknowns and leaves too much up to the developer

\* The design drawings looked like hotels and changed the low lying look of the building

If this design passed, we would need to:

- \* Enforce 2 stories on Watson - no higher than existing building
- \* No balconies on front of building (looks like hotel)
- \* Enforce existing footprint

The current building location negatively impacts the entire site. If a single multi-family building is desired, move it to the north side of the site.

Once again the building configuration ensures that some units face north away from the view. Big no-no! Two bar buildings oriented N/S with parking at the north would frame an open space that would open to the water ensuring that more units can enjoy a connection to the water and no unit would face north. Bars could be articulated to relate to massing of single family housing.

This one has more living units than some while also preserving more greenspace than some. Not ideal but better than some others.



**9. Density Hybrid Private and Public Use (40 units, 64 parking spaces)**

This option does not preserve enough green space

This design is unacceptable as 40 units is too many for this site. There are many positive aspects to this design if the new building was limited to ~24 units. I like the idea of public/private space, and urge the town to retain ownership of the public portion of the lot so it can't be developed in the future. I like the walking access between Watson and Fremont, as walking along Nayatt is dangerous without a sidewalk. There are way too many parking spots in this design, and the site/visitor parking should be set back from the roads. Any public use should be aligned towards senior's needs, and the development should be age restricted to help solve Barrington's senior housing needs. I strongly recommend this design be reconsidered with a 24 unit building and considerably less parking spaces.

Many residents walk their dogs and stroll their babies down these quiet, residential streets. Let's not destroy the area!

This design incorporates some acceptable elements.

It preserves open space to be enjoyed by Barrington residents, and one building maximizes the open space available (unlike the Cottage Court model which spreads lots of small buildings all over the property and effectively removes open space.)

I feel that the building should be age restricted (as promised at the TFM when the property was purchased) and feel IF designated sports/exercise areas were incorporated into the design they should be geared towards activities for older residents. However, I would prefer the grounds were primarily used for walking trails, with the incorporation of benches and a focus on conservation areas with wild flower meadow areas to encourage pollinators and native wildlife habitats. This is a beautiful site with established plants and trees, and unique views and it would provide a different recreational environment to those currently available, for Barrington residents to enjoy.

The connection between Fremont and Watson is especially welcome as a local walker I currently have to walk along Nayatt road, a dangerous option as there are no sidewalks beyond Broadview.

But this plan has too many units and too large a parking area.

The traffic increase that would come along with this option is completely unfeasible for the existing roads. This is a quiet residential neighborhood where young children are playing outside and pedestrians are walking around small streets. Bikers and walkers from all over town use these roads to avoid busier roads such as Nayatt and such an increase in traffic will only lead to accidents.

Not in favor of public recreation

- Will cause a huge increase in traffic
- Maintaining sports fields will cause runoff
- town has difficulty maintaining existing fields
- golf course already causing too much contamination to bay

This has the maximum public benefit. It produces the greatest number of homes although still outrageously expensive. By giving the public some more open space at least there is some benefit other than just creating private homes. Close the public parking spaces on weekends in summer to reduce neighborhood impact but allow the public to enjoy this beautiful spot the rest of the year. Don't age restrict the housing. There is a shortage for every demographic. Make the development 50% market to reduce the public subsidy cost and divide the rest among income groups: 5 at 100% of AMI; 5 at 80% AMI, 5 at 60% AMI and 5 at 30% AMI for people with special needs.

Ideal layout would be. 6 clusters of 5 attached units each around parking accessed from Watson and Fremont. Pedestrian access between clusters would lead to pedestrian only open space with public access from parking to the north. This "Radburn" like approach preserves the maximum open space and allows that open space to be shared by all units and the public separating cars and pedestrians. 30 units parking in clusters w/guest and public parking separate. Massing of cluster would be more compatible than single multi-family building.

<p><b>10. Open Space Only (0 units, 47 parking spaces)</b></p>
<p>I have already commented on the ridiculousness of these calls for "open space" and "walking trails"! (Please see my earlier comments) But I have question: If any aspect of the Watson proposal (such as removing the monastery building) has to back to the Town Financial Meeting in May, can a new motion be made (such as creating a miniature golf course, or leaving the lot "open space", etc) be made? If so, --in spite of my wanting to see the monastery building demolished -- it might be wise not to send the proposal back to the Town Meeting. It could be chaos and undo a year's worth of work by your committee.</p>
<p>I am a member of the 25 Watson Ad Hoc Committee and am a resident of the monastery neighborhood. I am unable to attend the next meeting in person on Monday, February 28 and will be observing via zoom. As an observer, I won't be able to offer comments, so I am taking this opportunity to express my views in this survey space.</p> <p>I am very disappointed by the numerous comments from neighbors endorsing turning the monastery property into open space. This is completely at odds with the wording and intent of the resolution passed at last year's Town Financial Meeting, which was adopted by town residents with the understanding the property would be used for senior and affordable housing.</p>
<p>The open space concept is the iteration I like the best. Assuming that the Parks and Recreation Department will maintain the open space and programming. Perhaps there's an opportunity for a community garden. The added community parking could address the public beach access and illegal street parking in our neighborhood.</p>
<p>This would, of course, be ideal, giving access to all Barrington residents to a beautiful site. A limited number of the parking spots could even be designated "beach permit" use, though this should not become a main entry for beach access (no bathrooms, beach is covered with water at high tide in this area, no lifeguards). A fitness trail/ walking path could go around the lot and a path through to Freemont would make it more accessible to Walkers coming from the other side of Nayatt.</p>
<p>This would be my #1 ranked choice, as the site has a fantastic bird's eye view of the Bay, beach, and estuary from an elevation of 42 feet above sea level. This use would be of the greatest benefit to town residents! It would have the least impact on the existing flora and fauna, which is extensive across this 7 acre plot. It would be a prime spot for viewing the sunset or moonset across the bay.</p>
<p>Hallelujah!!! Open space that celebrates the ocean and the beautiful landscape!! This is the winner for sure!!!</p>
<p>Asides from the financial implications, fully open space (with no neighborhood self policing) would probably end up as un-policed beach parking. Which is too bad, because this may be a nice place for a park.</p>
<p>This is my preferred option as it conserves green space for the benefit of Barrington residents for the future. I like that there is access from both Watson and Freemont. However I recognize this doesn't help Barrington solve it's senior housing needs.</p>
<p>This is most consistent with the principles laid out in the comprehensive community plan for Barrington. Preserve the unique character of the neighborhood, preserve open space, protect land that abuts costal zones, and provides a place for residents of Barrington to enjoy open undeveloped unique land, and views of the bay.</p>
<p>This would be my first choice. Let's preserve open land in Barrington and keep our town beautiful!</p>
<p>This is a very acceptable design. This property was purchased to preserve this beautiful natural area for the enjoyment of Barrington's residents and this design honors that promise. As has been expressed in the wider Barrington community there are currently no safe walking paths or natural areas that can be easily accessed by those with compromised mobility (including the elderly or young children) and a series of walking paths universally designed and accessible, with benches etc. would provide this. The pavilion area would be wonderful resource for communal events, and could be used by town groups from the youngest residents to the oldest. This beautiful site with established plants and trees, and unique views would be a perfect place to develop such an area. Preserving such an area for future generations would be an amazing gift to the townspeople of Barrington. Like the Rose Garden once it is gone it is gone forever. It also provides a safe walking connection between Freemont and Watson which is especially welcome as there are no sidewalks beyond the entrance to Broadview forcing walkers onto Nayatt Road which is dangerous.</p>

<p>- As desirable as open space is, it would be difficult to entice this committee to agree to strictly open space - walking trails and pavilion to enjoy the view would be welcome by all - not recouping the 3M may mean taxes increase for this enjoyment - would it become a teen hangout at night with underage drinking? - how would it be maintained?</p>
<p>I would prefer the town to invest in creating this a green space and accommodate some area as a playground. Even consider putting tennis court/volley ball. Make a fun place for the town</p>
<p>Design a multi sport facility for the town to enjoy</p>
<p>If tearing down the existing structure is on the table...I believe Open Space would be a wonderful amenity and a way to preseve view corridors and pay tribute to the Monastery.</p>
<p>This is my preferred short term option. Demolish the building and create public access open space until longer term development plan can be created. Do not commit to long-term open space use at this time. The building has sentimental value only. It has significant negative impact on the site for all uses. Housing development will cost \$600,000 to \$800,000 per unit. This needs to be thoroughly examined in a less volatle environment. Public parking can be blocked on summer holidays and weekends to reduce neighbor concerns and allow parking the other 340 days or so in the year.</p>
<p>This option would be my 2nd choice. My first choice was the Building re-use with 24 units and 57 parking spaces because I believe there is a need for "over 55" housing in Barrington. If we choose to demolish the building, I prefer passive open space for the town residents to utilize. As I heard mentioned by someone on your 3/28/22 zoom webinar, the town needs a safe space for the aging population to walk safely. The bike path and Veterans park are challenging spaces for the aging population to navigate. Thank you all who are donating your time and energy to this important matter.</p>
<p>Representing the BLCT, I feel that Concept 10 is the best choice. Barrington needs more usable, public-access properties with parking. This concept protects wildlife corridors, pollinator pathways, existing vegetation, and the view corridor to our beautiful bay.</p>
<p>Concept 10 is the best option. It provides the most open space, corridors for wildlife, pollinator pathways, and maintains existing space.</p>
<p>Preservation of open space should be our priority with so little of it left and this option provides an extension for wildlife from brickyard pond area. The space would have the added benefit of enhancing beach accessibility (as the town beach has been overcrowded the last 5 years).</p>
<p>Option #10 would help keep the shrinking natural space in Barrington intact. This is my primary concern for the property, which is one of the largest undeveloped tracts in town. If this is unfeasible due to financing, I would advocate for option #4 or #7, because they leave the smallest footprint on the property.</p>
<p>I have witnessed the incredible over-building in Barrington over the last 30 years...not just in number of houses, but in house size on small lots. We are in danger of losing every small parcel of green to development. Barrington is/was attractive because of its once-bucolic appearance, which it is in danger of losing, and indeed, has lost to some degree. The Town made a misstep many years ago by not acquiring the Karl Jones Rose Garden, which was a unique place of beauty and solace with a reputation far beyond Barrington. It is important that the Town stops seeing every bit of land as an opportunity for tax dollars. We are in a different era now...we have belatedly realized that we humans have to take better care of our environment, learn to exist with other life forms, and have to steward land when it becomes available. I miss the Barrington I moved to - when we had more space, more wild animals and birds, who at that time didn't encroach on neighborhoods as they do now, because there was more space for them. Now we view a coyote or fox sighting as something to be eradicated. This is so distorted. Let's be more than a town for just big houses, let's be a town with a connection to and respect for nature. Nowadays, when I want to go for a hike or day in the woods, I have to drive to the West side of the bay. This is a sad situation. Let's reorder our priorities. This town has an ample and affluent tax base. We don't need to squeeze money out of every vacant parcel of land. What we do need are more places of natural beauty and replenishment, and places for life forms other than our own. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>
<p>Not sure what I need to say beyond voting.</p>